

provisional Assistant Personnel Director from June 2020 to November 2020. She also included a resume with positions as a Senior Personnel Assistant from March 2014 forward, Administrative Assistant from September 2013 to February 2014, Administrative Coordinator with Cracovia, Inc. from January 2006 to August 2014, and Administrative Coordinator with Aaron P.B. Shipping Company from September 2005 to December 2005. Official records indicate that the appellant was a Senior Personnel Assistant from May 2017 to June 2020, a Keyboarding Clerk 2 from March 2016 to May 2017, a Keyboarding Clerk 1 from March 2014 to March 2016. The appellant was credited with six months of supervisory personnel experience, including the specialized experience of responsibility for a major public or private industry personnel program including review of classification problems and wage studies, handling personnel problems, and coordination of the training needs of the jurisdiction for her provisional position, and was found to be lacking one year, six months of required supervisory personnel experience, and six months of the specialized experience.

On appeal, the appellant states that in May 2019 her duties significantly changed when she started working as an Assistant Personnel Director. She states that she attends union grievances meetings, attends training classes, assists in handling personnel and employee relations problems, coordinates training needs, drafts salary guides and wage studies, provides assistance and advice on personnel issues, disseminates policy and procedural information, maintains performance evaluation records, recruits and interviews potential candidates, prepares reports, and supervises three individuals. She states that with her supervisor she has met representatives in the healthcare field to compare health plans, attended meetings to negotiate union contracts, researched compensation and classification issues, drafted the employee handbook updates, assembled and developed personnel, medical and employment files, oversaw the development of disciplinary action procedures, and attended weekly meetings with the Business Administrator.

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.6(a) provides that applicants shall meet all requirements specified in the promotional examination announcement by the closing date.

A review of the appellant's application reveals that she does not meet the announced requirements. When an applicant indicates extensive experience in titles established under the State Classification Plan, it is appropriate to utilize the job specifications to determine the primary focus of the duties of incumbents serving in career service titles. The experience description for the subject examination requires supervisory personnel experience. The appellant was credited for time in her provisional position. The appellant's remaining Civil Service titles are non-supervisory titles. Notwithstanding the fact that the appellant did not properly complete her application and list her Senior Personnel Assistant positions

separately from her clerical titles, a review of the duties that the appellant listed for her Senior Personnel Assistant position indicates that she was not performing supervisory duties while in that title. Additionally, the appellant's experience in the Keyboarding Clerk title series is primarily clerical in nature, as she was processing documents, scheduling appointments, gathering and tabulating data, providing notifications, utilizing software, maintaining and updating files, keyboarding, ordering supplies, and responding to questions. While this work was in the personnel field, it does not rise to the level of professional duties.

The appellant worked as an Administrative Assistant in the Mayor's Office where she took calls, forwarded complaints, distributed mail, created and directed attendees, assisted the Mayor on public outings, and updated the website. In one of her positions as an Administrative Coordinator, the appellant managed office operations, did bookkeeping, devised and implemented databases, organized workflow and trained staff, updated pricing, negotiated with retailers, approved credit applications, utilized software, and managed promotional campaigns. In her other position as Administrative Coordinator, she provided customer service, supplied data, was liaison between the shippers and the company, negotiated pricing, completed documents, did filing, and managed inventory of assets. None of these positions involved supervisory personnel functions.

A review of the appellant's application and arguments on appeal reveals that she does not meet the announced requirements. Applicants must demonstrate on their applications that the duties they perform provide them with the experience required for eligibility. *See In the Matter of Charles Klingberg* (MSB, decided August 28, 2001). Moreover, in order for experience to be considered applicable, it must have as its primary focus full-time responsibilities in the areas required in the announcement. *See In the Matter of Bashkim Vlashi* (MSB, decided June 9, 2004). While the appellant has longevity with this appointing authority, she lacks one year, six months of supervisory personnel experience, including six months of responsibility for a major public or private industry personnel program including review of classification problems and wage studies, handling personnel problems, and coordination of the training needs of the jurisdiction.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be denied.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON
THE 27TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2021



Deirdre L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Allison Chris Myers
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P. O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Magdalena Frangos
Vito Cimilluca
Division of Agency Services
Records Center